Student Health Provincial Summary of Annual Reports

2010/2011 School Year

September 1, 2010 to August 31, 2011

Alberta

CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION DATA

Cross-Ministry Services Branch
Student Health Provincial Summary of Annual Reports 2010/2011
September 1, 2010 to August 31, 2011

ISSN: 1920-9797
ISBN: 9780778596820

Note: Student Health is a joint endeavor of the Ministries of Education, Health, and Human Services.

For further information contact:

Student Health
Provincial Coordinator
44 Capital Boulevard
10044 – 108 Street Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 5E6

Telephone: (780) 422-6502
Fax: (780) 422-2039
Toll-free in Alberta by dialing 310–0000
Email: heather.dechant@gov.ab.ca

This document can be downloaded from the Alberta Government website:
http://education.alberta.ca/admin/healthandsafety/studenthealth/partnerinfo.aspx

© 2012, the Crown in Right of the Government of Alberta. Permission is given by the copyright owner to reproduce this document.

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Service Priorities in 2010/2011	2
II.	STUDENT HEALTH PERFORMANCE MEASURES	3
	A. Performance Measures and Targets	3
	B. Results Achieved	4
	1. Number of Service Events	4
	2. Surveys	8
	Teacher Survey Results	9
	Parent Survey Results	10
	Service Providers Survey Results	11
	Partner Survey Results	12
III.	HUMAN RESOURCES PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION	13
IV.	ANALYSIS OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES	16
	A. Revenues	16
	B. Expenditures	16
V.	ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CHALLENGES	18
	A. General Comments	18
	B. Major Accomplishments	18
	C. Challenges	20
	D. Progress in Integrating Student Health-Funded Services with Partner-Funded Services	20
	E. Continuous Improvement	20
VI.	APPENDICES	22
	Appendix A – Partnership Funding Allocations 2010/2011	23
	Appendix B – Partnership Breakdown Number of Service Events by Service Category 2010/2011	24
	Appendix C – Partnership Breakdown of Planned and Actual FTEs for 2010/2011	25
	Appendix D – Analysis of Revenue and Expenditures 2010/2011	27
	Appendix E – Student Health Expenditures by Service Category 2010/2011	28
	Appendix F – List of Tables	29

I. INTRODUCTION

Student Health is a joint endeavor of the Ministries of Education, Health, and Human Services. Information about Student Health can be found online at:

http://education.alberta.ca/admin/healthandsafety/studenthealth.aspx

Student Health operates on two foundational goals:

> Goal 1 – The short-term goal of Student Health is to improve access to integrated health and related services for children and youth with special health and support needs registered in school programs.
>
> Goal 2 – The long-term goal is to enable children and youth with health and support related needs to be successful in their school programs.

Student Health Partnerships work at the regional level to access student health needs, establish priorities and plan and deliver services. All partnerships, in the 2010/2011 school year, include Alberta Health Services, Child and Family Services Authorities and school authorities. These partnerships are accountable for the effective use of Student Health funding and for the outcomes for students with special health needs. In 2010/2011 there were 16 Student Health Partnerships and one Francophone Student Health Service Delivery Model.

Service Priorities in 2010 2011

Student Health Partnerships determine their service priorities based upon an assessment of student health needs in their region. Student Health services recognize cultural diversity, are provided in a culturally appropriate manner and include:

- rehabilitation (speech language therapy, physical therapy, occupational therapy, audiology and respiratory therapy);
- nursing care for children with specialized and/or complex health needs; and
- emotional-behavioural supports including behavioural interventions, therapy and counselling.

Consistent with previous years, the three most significant service priorities during the 2010/2011 school year were emotional/behavioural supports, speech language therapy and occupational therapy. Table 1 summarizes the number of service categories provided across all 16 Student Health Partnerships and one Francophone Student Health Service Delivery Model in Alberta during the 2010/2011 school year.

Service Category	**Number of Student Health Partnerships 2010/2011**
Speech language therapy	17
Occupational therapy	17
Emotional/behavioural supports	17
Physical therapy	11
Clinical nursing	4
Other	5
Teaching assistants	3
Respiratory therapy	1
Audiology	0

Table 1 – Number of Service Categories Provided by Student Health Partnerships 2010/2011 (n=17)

II. STUDENT HEALTH (SH) PERFORMANCE MEASURES

A. Performance Measures and Targets

During the 2010/2011 school year, Student Health Partnerships were required to report on two performance measures:

- access to student health services (number of service events); and
- access to coordinated/integrated services to improve student learning (Classroom Teacher, Parent and Student Health Partner surveys).

These performance measures assisted in identifying progress toward the achievement of the short-term goal related to improvement of access to integrated health and related services. The comparison of results from year to year also reflects overall trends in the achievement of Goal 2 of Student Health. As a requirement for Student Health funding, Student Health Partnerships are accountable for setting targets and for including those targets in their partnership Service Plans. Results at the end of each school year reflect the partnerships' ability to achieve their individual targets.

Student Health Partnerships are encouraged to develop additional goals, performance measures and targets to measure and demonstrate achievement in meeting the needs of students in their partnership.

B. Results Achieved

1. Number of Service Events

This performance measure reflects the accessibility of services funded through Student Health. The data illustrates the "service events," which are defined as the provision of one category of service to one child. One service event may consist of one contact (e.g., assessment or case consultation) or it may include multiple contacts (e.g., ongoing therapy). Some students have accessed more than one service event (e.g., they received services from several categories). As such, each service event does not necessarily represent one student being served.

During the 2010/2011 school year, 34,742 service events were provided through Student Health. Table 2 summarizes the number of service events in each category during the 2010/2011 school year. See Appendix B, page 24, for the number of service events in each category by each partnership.

Service Category	**Number of Service Events**	**Percentage of Total Service Events (%)**
Emotional/behavioural supports	15,806	46
Speech language therapy	11,232	32
Occupational therapy	5,362	15
Physical therapy	949	3
Respiratory therapy	751	2
Clinical nursing	360	1
Other[1]	244	1
Teaching assistants	38	<1
Audiology	0	0
Total	34,742	100

Table 2 – Number of Students Served in Each Service Category (Service Events)

[1] "Other" services include psycho-educational assessments, key contact specialists, special projects and resource/clinical coordination.

The projected actual and percentage change in the number of service events in each category is illustrated in Table 3. Across most service categories, the actual number of service events was higher than projected, with a total of 13.2% more services being provided than were projected in partnership Service Plans. The spike in the respiratory therapy represents an anomaly, reflecting the service events of one partnership. Consistent with previous results, the largest percentage increase continues to be in the speech language therapy service area.

Service Category	Projected Number of Service Events	Actual Number of Service Events	Percentage Change (%)
Respiratory therapy	150	751	401
Speech language therapy	8,240	11,232	36
Physical therapy	766	949	24
Other[1]	204	244	20
Occupational therapy	5,136	5,362	4
Emotional/behavioural supports	15,783	15,806	<1
Audiology	0	0	0
Teaching assistants	38	38	0
Clinical nursing	368	360	-2
Total	**30,685**	**34,742**	**13**

Table 3 - Number of Service Events in Each Category and Percentage Change

[1] "Other" services include psycho-educational assessments, key contact specialists, special projects and resource/clinical coordination.

Table 4, below, illustrates the comparison in the number of service events from 2009/2010 to the 2010/2011 school year. During the 2010/2011 school year, there were 498 more service events than in the previous year, an overall increase of 2%. Every partnership reported offering speech language therapy and there was an increase of 11% in the number of service events in this category from the 2009/2010 report. The high results reported in respiratory therapy do not reflect all of the partnerships; this number represents only one Student Health Partnership. The targets (Table 3, page 5) were estimates only, and many Student Health Partnerships reported higher demand for speech language service than expected. Some areas reported wider use of speech language assistants when available. The use of para-professionals along with a change in service delivery model helped meet referral demands.

Service Category	Number of Service Events 2009/2010	Number of Service Events 2010/2011	Percentage Change (%)
Respiratory therapy	100	751	651
Speech language therapy	10,080	11,232	11
Audiology	0	0	0
Emotional/behavioural supports	16,340	15,806	-3
Clinical nursing	382	360	-6
Other[1]	259	244	-6
Occupational therapy	5,759	5,362	-7
Physical therapy	1,125	949	-16
Teaching assistants	199	38	-81
Total	**34,244**	**34,742**	**2**

Table 4 - Comparison of the Number of Service Events from 2009/2010 to 2010/2011

[1] "Other" services include psycho-educational assessments, key contact specialists, special projects and resource/clinical coordination.

Tables 5a and 5b, below, illustrate the percentage of students who completed services in the 2010/2011 school year who either met their service goals or benefited from service provider recommendations. Of the Student Health Partnerships who reported, the following results are documented:

Percentage of Students who Completed their Goals:	**Percentage (%)**
Percentage of students who met **all** (100%) of their goals	44
Percentage of students who met **most** (75-99%) of their goals	28
Percentage of students who met **some** (50-74%) of their goals	17
Percentage of students who met **few** (1-49%) of their goals	7
Percentage of students who met **none** (0%) of their goals	4
Total	**100%**

Table 5a – Percentage of Students Who Completed Their Goals

Percentage of Students who Benefited from Service Provider Recommendations:	**Percentage (%)**
Percentage of students who benefited from **all** (100%) of the recommendations.	48
Percentage of students who benefited from **most** (75-99%) of the recommendations.	34
Percentage of students who benefited from **some** (50-74%) of the recommendations.	11
Percentage of students who benefited from **few** (1-49%) of the recommendations.	4
Percentage of students who benefited from **none** (0%) of the recommendations.	3
Total	**100%**

Table 5b – Percentage of Students Who Benefited From Service Provider Recommendations

2. Surveys

Each year, Student Health Partnerships conduct a series of surveys with stakeholders in order to gather input related to the effectiveness and efficiency of Student Health in supporting students with special health needs to be successful in their school programs. Respondent stakeholder groups annually surveyed include:

- Teachers
- Parents of children who receive services through Student Health Partnerships
- Service providers
- Partners

In their service plans, Student Health Partnerships are required to set targets for the percentage of these stakeholder respondents who will agree or strongly agree; however, there is variation in the targets set by each Student Health Partnerships. Respondent percentages for each stakeholder group are noted in the tables on the following pages. Longitudinal results from the Teacher Survey are provided from 2006/2007 to 2010/2011. Results from the other three survey groups are available for 2009/2010 and 2010/2011.

The results from the surveys are calculated by dividing the provincial total number of respondents who agree/strongly agree in each stakeholder group by the total number of surveys completed by that group. This provides equal weighting for each participant's response regardless of the number of respondents in a Student Health Partnership.

In their annual reports, Student Health Partnerships are also asked to include anecdotal comments from respondents along with the survey data obtained. Comments are aggregated by theme and provided in two categories:

1. Those that felt the Student Health Partnerships were successful in their effectiveness and efficiency in supporting students with special health needs to be successful in their school programs, and
2. Those who saw challenges in meeting special health needs of students.

Student Health Partnerships noted that responses varied by service categories. Respondent comments are provided in the tables on the following pages.

The surveys reflect a consistent high level of satisfaction related to the implementation and impact of Student Health from the teachers and the service providers, while the partner surveys remained virtually the same. A marginal increase level of satisfaction was demonstrated from the parent survey, by .60%. However, the fifth question of both the teacher and parent surveys continues to improve, with satisfaction levels of 85.4% and 90.1%, respectively, evidence that Goal Two of the program is being met: *The long term goal is to enable children and youth with health and support related needs to be successful in their school programs.*

Table 5 reflects the strong satisfaction rate among teachers who report that Student Health services greatly improve students' abilities to be successful at learning, as evidenced by the 3.6% increase in the overall total.

Teacher Survey Results

Teachers' Rating Statement	Agree or Strongly Agree (%)				
	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
For each of my students with a special health need, an adequate plan is in place to provide student health services.	78.1	88.5	91.2	84.7	87.3
It is easy to refer students for student health services.	82.7	88.9	83.3	83.1	84.7
Student health services are provided within a reasonable time after a referral.	63.0	70.3	67.2	66.3	72.0
The student health services that my students need are available.	72.3	74.8	74.3	72.4	79.1
The student health services have improved my students' abilities to be successful at learning.	77.9	86.1	83.1	82.2	85.4
For my students who need more than one student health service, the various services are well coordinated.	67.4	80.0	75.1	78.2	79.7
OVERALL	**73.6**	**81.4**	**79.0**	**77.8**	**81.4**

Table 6a – Teacher Survey Results

General Conclusions based on Teacher Comments:

Positive	Challenges
• There is a positive perception that the services offered through Student Health Partnerships significantly contribute to student learning. • There was a high degree of satisfaction with the planning, communication and collaboration between school staff and service providers. • The referral process was streamlined, new forms were created and efficient, timely practices were introduced, all contributing to positive responses on the survey. • Teachers felt the services were equitable and well-coordinated, especially speech language therapy, occupational therapy and physical therapy. • With the focus on intervention rather than recommendation, the results of the student health services exceeded expectations.	• The high demand and heavy caseloads made scheduling services difficult. • Staff turnover remains a problem.

Table 6b – Teacher Comments

Parent Survey Results

Parents' Rating Statement	Agree or Strongly Agree %	
	2009/2010	2010/2011
I was included in the development of the service plan for my child.	88.3	88.0
The referral process was easy.	92.2	92.0
The student health service was provided within a reasonable time after the referral.	87.8	87.5
The health service that my child needs is available.	90.3	90.5
The student health service has improved my child's ability to be successful in his/her school program.	89.0	90.1
If my child needed more than one student health service, the various services were well coordinated.	82.9	84.6
I had sufficient contact and communication with the service provider.	82.4	84.3
Overall, I am satisfied with the student health service that my child received.	88.1	88.6
OVERALL	**87.6**	**88.2**

Table 7a – Parent Survey Results

General Conclusions based on Parent Comments:

Positive	Challenges
• High levels of satisfaction reflects the strong communication links developed between parents/guardians and the stakeholders. • Parents/guardians felt affirmed, informed and included in the process of creating a service plan. • Speech language services were rated highly by the parents/guardians and created positive outcomes both at school and at home. • Mental health services received high satisfaction ratings from the parents/guardians. • Overall, a connection was made between success in school and the supports offered by the Student Health Partnerships.	• The referral process remains a focus for future improvement. • The coordination of the service providers, the continuation of the services from year to year are areas of concern raised by parents/guardians.

Table 7b – Parent Comments

Service Provider Survey Results

Service Providers' Rating Statement	Agree or Strongly Agree %	
	2009/2010	2010/2011
I contribute to the development of service plans for students.	94.6	94.0
The referral information I receive provides me what I need to provide student health services to students.	89.1	85.1
I am able to provide student health services within a reasonable time after the referral.	87.4	90.2
The health services that students need are available.	70.5	77.2
The students achieved their service goals.	92.2	93.2
For students who need more than one student health service, the various services were well coordinated.	63.6	71.6
I am satisfied with the level of teamwork among the students, parents, teachers and service providers.	73.7	76.8
OVERALL	**81.6**	**84.0**

Table 8a – Service Provider Survey Results

General Conclusions based on Service Provider Comments:

Positive	Challenges
• Service providers ranked, the communication and collaboration between themselves, school staff and parents as very high. • Setting aggressive targets, the service providers continue to strive for improvement in the delivery of their services. • Alberta Health Services were fully staffed and the waiting time was minimal. • Capacity building initiatives helped to strengthen the delivery teams and the process in place allowed for timely service delivery. • After the referral, the service providers were prompt in making the initial contact with parents, keeping them well informed.	• Coordination of services continues to be a challenge due to scheduling conflicts, shortage of time and those students requiring multiple services. These factors hamper effective collaboration. • Service providers indicate that there are staffing issues that are creating barriers. Inadequate staffing, changing staff mid-year creating vacancies, and illness of staff are a source of frustration for the service providers. • There are a disproportionate number of children with needs than there are resources to serve them. • Certain challenges in the referral process were specifically noted such as prolonged wait times. There is a need for streamlining the referral process and greater clarity in the content of the referral forms.

Table 8b – Service Provider Comments

Partner Survey Results

Partners' Rating Statement	Agree or Strongly Agree %	
	2009/2010	2010/2011
For students who need more than one student health service, the various services are well coordinated.	86.6	92.7
Partners plan collaboratively.	94.1	94.0
Partners make decisions collaboratively.	94.7	92.1
Partner funded and Student Health funded services are well integrated.	90.6	86.4
The student health services improve student's abilities to be successful in their school programs.	97.1	98.0
OVERALL	**92.6**	**92.6**

Table 9a – Partner Survey Results

General Conclusions based on Partner Comments:

Positive	Challenges
• The survey results clearly reflect the positive, respectful, trust-based relationship that exists among the partners. • Proactive, strategic planning has helped to provide meaningful and efficient, coordinated delivery of services. • The high degree of collaboration that exists contributes to services that are well integrated. • The flexibility of the partnerships allows for varied and cooperative decision making. • There is strong consensus among the partnerships; they acknowledge and value how effective Student Health is in contributing to students' success in schools.	• Insecurity around funding and sustainability was a prevalent theme expressed by many of the partnerships. • Filling mental health and emotional/behavioral positions. • Coordinating these services is a concern shared by the partnerships. • The need to promote the importance of the survey to the partners to improve the return rates. • A clear, consistent understanding of the philosophy, training and practices among service providers would greatly assist in the delivery of student health services.

Table 9b – Partner Comments

III. HUMAN RESOURCES PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

In their annual reports, Student Health Partnerships reported on the number of positions they had planned to fill, as recorded in their Service Plans, plus the number of positions actually filled. Partnerships do not directly employ or contract staff. The individual partners employ or contract service providers on behalf of the partnership according to the Service Plans. The Service Plans and annual reports include only direct service provider full-time equivalents (FTEs) employed or contracted using Student Health funds. They do not include FTEs or the portion of an FTE, employed or contracted with funds from other sources. They do not include FTEs for supervisory or administrative support staff.

For the 2010/2011 school year, partnerships reported a total of 467.76 FTEs employed or contracted (346.91 FTE professional and 120.85 FTE para-professional). The number of professional FTEs employed or contracted in 2010/2011 decreased by 20.50 FTEs and the number of para-professional FTEs employed or contracted decreased by 2.04 FTEs over the 2009/2010 school year.

Service Category	Total Number of FTEs	Percentage of Total FTEs (%)
Emotional/behavioural supports	220.93	47
Speech language therapy	139.92	30
Occupational therapy	69.32	15
Physical therapy	11.91	3
Teaching assistants	12.80	3
Nursing	6.38	1
Other[1]	6.26	1
Respiratory therapy	0.24	<1
Audiology	0.00	0
Total	**467.76**	**100**

Table 10 – Total FTEs by Service Category

[1] "Other" includes psycho-educational assessments, key contact specialists, special projects and resource/clinical coordination.

Student Health Partnerships were not able to fill all of the planned staffing for professional and para-professional FTEs during the 2010/2011 school year. Physical therapy, occupational therapy, respiratory therapy, and clinical nursing categories reported as expected or slightly higher. Overall, 95% of planned FTEs were filled in 2010/2011. The following table summarizes the provincial total of FTEs that were planned and filled across all service categories.

Service Provider Type	Number of FTEs Planned	Number of FTEs Filled	Percent of Planned FTEs Filled
Professional	367.41	346.91	94.42
Para-professional	122.89	120.85	98.34
Total	**490.30**	**467.76**	95.40

Table 11 – Total FTEs Planned and Filled

Table 12, below, provides a summary of FTEs planned and filled for each service category.

Service Category	Number of FTEs Planned	Number of FTEs Filled	Percent of Planned FTEs Filled (%)
Speech language therapy			
Professional	63.1	63.1	100
Para-professional	81.0	76.9	95
Total	**144.1**	**139.9**	**97**
Physical therapy			
Professional	10.0	9.8	98
Para-professional	3.2	2.2	68
Total	**13.2**	**11.9**	**91**
Occupational therapy			
Professional	56.8	53.1	93
Para-professional	13.5	16.2	121
Total	**70.3**	**69.3**	**99**
Audiology			
Professional	0.0	0.0	0
Para-professional	0.0	0.0	0
Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**
Respiratory therapy			
Professional	0.2	0.2	100
Para-professional	0.0	0.0	0
Total	**0.2**	**0.2**	**100**
Clinical Nursing			
Professional	4.7	4.6	99
Para-professional	1.8	1.8	100
Total	**6.4**	**6.4**	**99**
Emotional/behavioural supports			
Professional	222.0	205.6	93
Para-professional	15.0	15.4	102
Total	**237.0**	**220.9**	**93**
Teaching assistants			
Professional	6.4	6.4	100
Para-professional	6.4	6.4	100
Total	**12.8**	**12.8**	**100**
Other			
Professional	4.1	4.2	101
Para-professional	2.2	2.1	98
Total	**6.3**	**6.3**	**100**
Total	490.3	467.8	95

Table 12 - Total FTEs Planned and Number Filled for Each Service Category

A breakdown of the planned and actual FTEs by partnership is provided in Appendix C on page 25 of this summary.

In their annual reports, Student Health Partnerships provided rationales on the variance between planned and actual FTEs. When fewer or more than planned FTEs were filled or FTEs were moved to other service categories, the rationales provided fall into the following categories:

- Recruitment challenges due to limited availability of service providers.
- Shortages of professional staff in a service category, therefore more para-professionals are hired.
- Increased staffing costs resulted in the need to decrease staff numbers.
- Medical/maternity leaves and staff turnover altered staffing practices.
- Changes in the service delivery model (e.g., group therapy, consultation services for teaching staff) created efficiencies when service demand was greater than anticipated.

Several unique issues were reported and worthy of note:

- Student Health Partnerships noted that they had worked collaboratively with other service providers in order to maximize the services to students.
- A number of Student Health Partnerships identified capacity building with teachers to maximize strategies based on best practice that would benefit a larger number of students.
- To meet increasing demands, many Student Health Partnerships are examining best practices related to service delivery models in order to increase efficiencies and to reach more students.

IV. ANALYSIS OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

A. Revenues

The provincial total of Student Health revenues to partnerships for the 2010/2011 school year were $45,443,539. This figure included an allocation of $1,948,770 for administration costs. Total revenues available to partnerships also included interest earned on Student Health funds. Total revenues are summarized below:

Revenue Source	Total Revenue ($)
Annual service delivery allocation	41,708,185*
Annual administration allocation	1,948,770
Surplus from prior years	1,786,584
TOTAL	**45,443,539**

Table 13 – Revenues 2010/2011
* includes $135,808 in interest

B. Expenditures

The provincial total Student Health Partnership expenditure for the 2010/2011 school year was $41,975,121. Expenditures are summarized below:

Expenditure Type	Total Expenditures ($)	Percentage of Total Expenditures (%)
Actual salaries and benefits for FTEs	36,802,069	88
Actual other service delivery costs	3,851,746	9
Actual administration costs	1,321,306	3
TOTAL	**41,975,121**	**100**

Table 14 – Expenditures 2010/2011

A full breakdown of Revenues and Expenditures for 2010/2011 can be found in Appendix D on page 27.

The service delivery expenditures, including other administration costs, can be broken down into expenditures by service category. (A summary of Student Health Expenditures by Service Category for 2010/2011 can be found in Appendix E on page 28):

Service Category	Total Expenditures ($)	Percentage of Total Expenditures (%)
Emotional/Behavioural Supports	20,123,979	49.4
Speech language therapy	10,271,901	25.2
Occupational therapy	6,623,285	16.3
Other[1]	1,538,771	3.8
Physical therapy	1,176,474	2.9
Clinical nursing	608,275	1.5
Teacher assistants	369,102	0.9
Respiratory therapy	29,302	0.1
Teacher replacement	9,645	<0.1
Audiology	0	0
Human resource support for service delivery	0	0.0
Total	**40,750,734**	**100.0**

Table 15 – Expenditures by Service Category 2010/2011

[1] "Other" services include: psycho-educational assessments, key contact specialists, special projects and resource/clinical coordination.

V. ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CHALLENGES

A. General Comments

- Overall, survey results from the teachers, parents/guardians, service providers and partners reflected an overall increase in satisfaction levels.
- All of the stakeholders' testimonials indicate that Student Health services resulted in students being more successful in school.
- In their efforts to deliver a more integrated, coordinated and consistent service model, the partners attempted to provide shared coverage across the partnership area, offering a more regional model versus a geographical model.
- A need was expressed, both provincially and by the partnerships, for a clear definition and understanding of capacity building.
- Time allotted for collaboration within the partnerships resulted in cultivating strong relationships of mutual understanding and a common purpose.
- In some partnerships, a need for dedicated time to support planning, integration and collaboration was expressed.
- Some service providers offered summer programs to enhance understanding in Speech language pathology and occupational therapy, and received a favorable response from the participants.
- Presently, the parent survey is only in English and French, this is problematic for those parents who don't speak either language.
- Different service delivery models and under-staffing still exists in some areas; both of which create difficulties in best meeting the health needs of students.

B. Major Accomplishments

In their annual reports, partnerships had the opportunity to share a summary of their major accomplishments during the 2010/2011 school year. A sample of accomplishments shared among several partnerships include:

Service Delivery Model:

- Worked collaboratively to stay within budget, managed to increase the number of student health services offered and achieved overall higher results from the satisfaction surveys.
- Developed innovative practices offering in-services for school-based personnel and engaged in cross-partnership sharing, exchanging best practices with other Student Health Partnerships.
- Incorporated cross-disciplinary support for the education and professional development of school personnel, parents and partners.
- Renewed commitment to reduce wait times for assessments and treatment resulted in improved satisfaction results on surveys.
- Increased availability of services, increased the number of students served and overall satisfaction levels were improved.

Service Provider:

- Expanded the mandate of service delivery by offering summer programs in speech language pathology and occupational therapy programming.
- Developed creative programming through mental health teams, offering proactive programs, mentorship and conducted individual and family consultations.
- Collaborative efforts of Alberta Health Services, school jurisdictions and Student Health partnerships contributed to the successful implementation of the Student Health service plans.
- A focused effort on prevention and early intervention has contributed to a large number of students served in the speech language service delivery area.
- The use of webcam technology offers a unique method of virtual supervision and consultation, especially relevant to speech language therapy.

Communication Strategies:

- The use of online surveys has contributed to a substantial increase in the returns.
- The collaborative team approach improves the referral process, involves the parents in the service planning and generates substantial information.
- A variety of methods of communication were used to disseminate the information to the Student Health stakeholders: newsletters, frontline staff meetings, workshops, video-conferencing, teleconferencing surveys and brochures.
- Enhanced communication was noted due to the updated directory of partners and service providers.

Professional Development/Training and Orientation

- Continue to develop capacity building initiatives such as summer training sessions for educational assistants, preschool screening fairs, rural rehabilitation team sessions, and occupational therapy sessions offered in schools/homes/communities with an early years focus.
- Through cross-sector and regional level events, mental health needs are being addressed.
- Continue to collect quantitative and qualitative data of unmet needs in order to determine the existing gaps in service delivery.
- The need for coordinated services across sectors and clear definitions for universal, targeted and specialized service delivery models.
- Occupational therapy staff articulated hand development skills through capacity building activities.

Other:

- A need was expressed for ongoing training for school staff by occupational therapists and mental health therapists.
- Offer in-services to teachers and educational assistants, to provide knowledge and understanding about the referral process.
- Explore other sources of professional consultation regarding student health issues without increasing costs.

C. Challenges

In their annual reports, partnerships had the opportunity to share a summary of their major challenges during the 2010/2011 school year. These challenges included:

Staffing Service Providers:

- The funding formula, along with salary and benefit increases, all threatened the sustainability of staffing/service levels.
- The future of Student Health Partnerships and how that impacts recruitment and retention of staff generated a level of anxiety among the partnerships.
- Recruiting bilingual service providers and securing rehabilitation services in rural communities.
- Time for collaboration is critical as the complexity of student needs involved more sectors in the delivery of services.
- Despite positive indicators, mental health caseloads are over taxed, there are long wait lists and a great need exists in rural areas of the province.

Other:

- Numbers of students being referred has increased and resources are stretched thin.

D. Progress in Integrating Student Health-Funded Services with Partner-Funded Services

Partnerships are required to describe how their efforts to work collaboratively made improvements in their efficient and effective use of partner-funded services along with Student Health funding. Partnerships described:

- scheduling meetings for service providers, parents and school personnel on the same day to create efficiencies
- unforeseeable circumstances caused duress in two partnerships, services were strained, however, the partnerships rallied, remained active and supportive during those challenging times

E. Continuous Improvement

Partnerships are required to identify existing and/or planned continuous improvement activities to enhance the planning and delivery of Student Health services. Partnerships identified plans in several areas including:

Service Delivery Model:

- Evolve the model of service delivery that will support inclusion and a coordination of services across sectors for universal, targeted and specialized supports.
- Conduct research to identify the gaps in supporting children with emotional/behavioral needs.
- Review the referral process to ensure teachers, parents and service providers have sound knowledge and a clear understanding of what "reasonable time after referral" means.
- Ensure service providers understand the purpose, value and procedure of collecting data.
- Enhance access to emotional/behavioral supports, speech language therapy, occupational therapy, and physical therapy services through utilizing alternate models of service delivery.
- Expand the use of group delivery of services and video-conferencing to provide service.
- Parents as integral partners in the development of creating service plans.
- Create consistency among service providers as to how they develop and report on goals.

Orientation and Training:

- Provide orientation to new Student Health Partners to ensure a common understanding of the work of the partnership.
- Implement on-going training for para-professionals to enhance skills in providing direct service under the supervision of professionals.

VI. APPENDICES

Appendix A – Partnership Funding Allocations 2010/2011

Appendix B – Partnership Breakdown Number of Service Events by Service Category 2010/2011

Appendix C – Partnership Breakdown of Planned and Actual FTEs 2010/2011

Appendix D – Analysis of Revenue and Expenditures 2010/2011

Appendix E – Student Health Expenditures by Service Category 2010/2011

Appendix F – List of Tables

Appendix A – partnership Funding Allocations 2010/2011

Partnership	Service Delivery Allocation ($)	Administration Allocation ($)	Total Allocation ($)
Aspen	1,425,884	67,188	1,493,072
Calgary Rocky View	11,612,931	547,206	12,160,137
Central Alberta	3,767,145	177,509	3,944,654
Chinook Country	2,314,505	108,354	2,422,859
Edmonton	8,491,229	400,110	8,891,339
Francophone	398,156	13,280	411,436
Golden Prairie	807,983	38,073	846,056
Leduc and Area	659,060	31,055	690,115
Northern Lights – Fort Vermillion	393,808	18,556	412,364
Peace Country	1,716,304	80,873	1,797,177
Parkland, Evergreen and Area	843,403	39,741	883,144
SHIP 15	639,500	30,133	669,633
Southeastern Alberta	1,362,092	64,182	1,426,274
St. Albert	1,227,516	57,653	1,285,169
Tri-Partite	3,854,967	182,142	4,037,109
Westview	1,284,655	56,277	1,340,932
Wood Buffalo	773,242	36,435	809,677
TOTAL	**41,572,380**	**1,948,767**	**43,521,147**

Table 16 – Partnership Funding Allocations 2010/2011

APPENDIX B - Partnership Breakdown Number of Service Events By Service Category 2010/2011

Partnership	Speech Therapy	Physical Therapy	Occupational Therapy	Audiology	Respiratory Therapy	Clinical Nursing	Emotional/ Behavioural	Teaching Assistants	Other	TOTAL
Aspen	590	0	696	0	0	0	804	0	0	2,090
Central Alberta	1,138	94	386	0	0	75	2,259	0	0	3,952
Calgary Rocky View	1,339	311	1,165	0	0	0	2,753	25	0	5,593
Chinook Country	776	67	73	0	0	0	1,667	0	33	2,616
Edmonton	3,160	168	989	0	0	174	1,011	0	121	5,623
Francophone	82	3	43	0	0	0	31	0	1	160
Golden Prairie	253	4	12	0	0	8	382	0	69	728
Parkland, Evergreen and Area	489	0	0	0	0	0	343	0	20	852
Leduc and Area	248	0	95	0	0	81	274	0	0	698
Northern Lights – Fort Vermillion	168	12	25	0	0	0	65	0	0	270
Peace Country	602	3	282	0	0	0	1,445	0	0	2,332
SHIP 15	232	0	12	0	0	0	357	0	0	601
Southeastern Alberta	547	38	59	0	751	0	912	13	0	2,320
St. Albert	577	0	98	0	0	0	493	0	0	1,168
Tri-Partite	472	93	884	0	0	22	1,842	0	0	3,313
Wood Buffalo	381	66	185	0	0	0	695	0	0	1,327
Westview	178	90	358	0	0	0	473	0	0	1,099
TOTAL	**11,232**	**949**	**5,362**	**0**	**751**	**360**	**15,806**	**38**	**244**	**33,643**
% of total	33.4%	2.8%	15.9%	0.0%	2.2%	1.1%	47.0%	0.1%	0.7%	100.0%

Table 17 – Partnership Breakdown Number of Service Events by Service Category 2010/2011

[1] "Other" services include psycho-educational assessments, key contact specialists, special projects and resource/clinical coordination.

APPENDIX C – Partnership Breakdown of Planned and Actual FTEs for 2010/2011

Professional FTEs 2010/2011

Partnership	Speech planned	Speech filled	PT planned	PT filled	OT planned	OT filled	Audio planned	Audio filled	RT planned	RT filled	Nursing planned	Nursing filled	E/B planned	E/B filled	TA planned	TA filled	Other planned	Other filled	Total planned	Total filled
Aspen	0.30	0.50	0.00	0.00	2.20	1.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.20	12.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.70	14.48
Central Alberta	7.45	7.25	0.77	0.77	3.60	3.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.20	1.20	26.51	24.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	39.53	37.21
Calgary Rocky View	15.00	15.00	4.00	4.00	20.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	63.93	63.33	6.40	6.40	0.00	0.00	109.33	108.73
Chinook Country	6.00	6.00	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.95	8.45	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.44	19.17	15.89
Edmonton	13.00	13.65	2.70	2.60	12.10	12.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.50	2.60	28.60	20.50	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.80	59.70	52.19
Francophone	1.33	1.28	0.02	0.08	0.79	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.24	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	2.40	2.47
Golden Prairie	6.00	5.57	0.11	0.10	0.18	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.07	5.58	6.64	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.20	12.35	12.72
Parkland, Evergreen and Area	1.80	1.80	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.50	2.70	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	6.30	5.00
Leduc and Area	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.60	0.60	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.10	2.10
Northern Lights – Fort Vermillion	0.20	0.20	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.60	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00
Peace Country	3.80	3.80	0.00	0.40	2.40	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.50	7.90	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	15.20	14.60
SHIP 15	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	5.00
Southeastern Alberta	1.33	1.33	0.25	0.25	0.34	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.24	0.24	0.00	0.00	3.90	3.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.06	6.06
St. Albert	1.30	0.69	0.00	0.00	2.35	2.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.55	6.60	0.00	0.00	1.70	1.70	11.90	11.49
Tri-Partite	1.11	1.28	0.35	0.35	7.38	5.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.16	31.63	29.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40.77	35.97
Wood Buffalo	1.20	1.40	0.60	0.10	1.10	1.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	7.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.90	10.10
Westview	1.30	1.30	0.60	0.50	2.80	2.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.30	6.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.00	10.90
Total	**63.12**	**63.05**	**10.00**	**9.75**	**56.84**	**53.11**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.24**	**0.24**	**4.68**	**4.63**	**221.99**	**205.57**	**6.40**	**6.40**	**4.14**	**4.16**	**367.41**	**346.91**

Table 18 – Partnership Breakdown of Professional FTEs Planned and Actual 2010/2011

[1] "Other" services include psycho-educational assessments, key contact specialists, special projects and resource/clinical coordination

Para-Professional FTEs 2010/2011

Partnership	Speech planned	Speech filled	PT planned	PT filled	OT planned	OT filled	Audio planned	Audio filled	RT planned	RT filled	Nursing planned	Nursing filled	E/B planned	E/B filled	TA planned	TA filled	Other planned	Other filled	Total planned	Total - filled
Aspen	4.68	3.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.68	4.48
Central Alberta	9.74	9.18	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.90	0.90	13.14	10.58
Calgary Rocky View	8.00	8.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	6.40	6.40	0.00	0.00	20.90	20.90
Chinook Country	9.21	10.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.75	6.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.96	16.66
Edmonton	18.50	17.16	0.80	0.80	5.10	5.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.70	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.10	23.82
Francophone	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Golden Prairie	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.05	1.05	1.50	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.20	2.75	2.75
Parkland, Evergreen and Area	1.40	1.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.38	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.78	1.78
Leduc and Area	2.64	2.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.60	2.55	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.40	5.64	5.59
Northern Lights – Fort Vermilion	6.00	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.00	6.00
Peace Country	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.80	2.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.80	3.80
SHIP 15	3.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00
Southeastern Alberta	4.33	4.33	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.44	6.44
St. Albert	2.50	1.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.50	1.80
Tri-Partite	5.95	4.15	0.00	0.00	1.30	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.65	0.60	7.90	6.95
Wood Buffalo	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50
Westview	3.50	3.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.30	2.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.80	5.80
Total	**80.95**	**76.87**	**3.16**	**2.16**	**13.45**	**16.21**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**1.75**	**1.75**	**15.03**	**15.36**	**6.40**	**6.40**	**2.15**	**2.10**	**122.89**	**120.85**

Table 19 – partnership Breakdown of Para-professional FTEs Planned and Actual 2010/2011

[1] "Other" services include psycho-educational assessments, key contact specialists, special projects and resource/clinical coordination.

APPENDIX D – Analysis of Revenue and Expenditures 2010/2011

Partnership	Service Delivery Allocation ($)	Admin Allocation ($)	Surplus from 2008-09 ($)	Interest ($)	Total Revenues for 2009-10 ($)	Actual Salaries and Benefits for FTEs ($)	Actual Other[1] Student Health Service Delivery Costs ($)	Actual Admin Costs ($)	Total Expenses 2009/2010 ($)	Net Operating Results ($)
Aspen	1,425,884	67,188	29,235	3,437	1,525,744	1,278,357	32,948	59,104	1,370,409	155,335
Calgary Rocky View	11,612,931	547,206	416,698	20,160	12,596,995	10,000,511	1,699,769	541,421	12,241,701	355,294
Central Alberta	3,767,145	177,509	125,698	21,779	4,092,131	3,624,488	105,671	107,637	3,837,796	254,335
Chinook Country	2,314,505	108,354	-180,272	6,822	2,249,409	2,126,700	134,699	42,334	2,303,733	-54,324
Edmonton	8,491,229	400,110	1,838	32,188	8,925,365	6,935,564	802,676	96,919	7,835,159	1,090,206
Francophone	398,156	13,280	-3,263	0	408,173	237,269	129,740	13,280	380,289	27,884
Golden Prairie	807,983	38,073	54,462	4,439	904,957	810,816	10,151	38,073	859,040	45,917
Leduc and Area	659,060	31,055	31,012	2,865	723,992	586,035	30,395	24,500	640,930	83,062
Northern Lights – Fort Vermillion	393,808	18,556	48,937	0	461,301	397,555	36,268	3,012	436,835	24,466
Peace Country	1,716,304	80,873	140,777	526	1,938,480	1,638,285	128,670	26,993	1,793,948	144,532
Parkland, Evergreen and Area	843,403	39,741	157,743	3,653	1,044,540	776,234	31,151	26,499	833,884	210,656
SHIP 15	639,500	30,133	111,777	2,279	783,689	595,582	32,449	23,675	651,706	131,983
Southeastern Alberta	1,362,092	64,182	4,141	5,555	1,435,970	1,308,233	97,828	11,510	1,417,571	18,399
St. Albert	1,227,516	57,653	234,191	8,239	1,527,599	958,027	101,388	50,669	1,110,084	417,515
Tri-Partite	3,854,967	182,142	92,766	11,993	4,141,868	3,344,432	383,324	182,511	3,910,267	231,601
Westview	1,284,655	56,277	1,161	4,429	1,346,522	1,242,623	58,081	39,911	1,340,615	5,907
Wood Buffalo	773,242	36,435	519,683	7,444	1,336,804	941,358	36,538	33,258	1,011,154	325,650
TOTAL	**41,572,380**	**1,948,767**	**1,786,584**	**135,808**	**45,443,539**	**36,802,069**	**3,851,746**	**1,321,306**	**41,975,121**	**3,468,418**
% of total	91.48%	4.29%	3.93%	0.30%	100%	87.68%	9.18%	3.15%	100%	

Table 20 – Partnership Breakdown of Revenue and Expenditures 2010/2011

"Other" services include psycho-educational assessments, key contact specialists, special projects and resource/clinical coordination.

APPENDIX E - Student Health Expenditures by Service Category 2010/2011

Partnership	Speech language Therapy	Physical Therapy	Occupational Therapy	Audiology	Respiratory Therapy	Clinical Nursing	Emotional/ Behavioural Supports	Teacher Assistants	Teacher Replacement	HR Support for Service Delivery	Other[1]	TOTAL
Aspen	117,059	0	207,607	0	0	0	986,639	0	0	0	0	1,311,305
Calgary Rocky View	2,041,070	503,963	2,269,716	0	0	0	6,263,186	270,192	0	0	352,153	11,700,280
Central Alberta	1,256,265	95,292	375,102	0	0	113,296	1,890,205	0	0	0	0	3,730,160
Chinook Country	939,053	55,775	55,775	0	0	0	1,066,904	9,193	0	0	134,699	2,261,399
Edmonton	2,625,559	346,394	1,858,417	0	0	378,661	2,379,483	0	0	0	246,645	7,835,159
Francophone	175,521	12,296	97,343	0	0	0	41,628	0	0	0	40,221	367,009
Golden Prairie	179,570	8,674	14,648	0	0	43,919	531,425	0	0	0	42,731	820,966
Leduc and Area	162,198	0	45,355	0	0	67,102	338,517	0	3,258	0	0	616,430
Northern Lights – Fort Vermillion	221,851	8,289	16,578	0	0	0	187,105	0	0	0	0	433,823
Peace Country	455,759	4,521	335,780	0	0	0	858,260	0	0	0	112,635	1,766,955
Parkland, Evergreen and Area	275,076	0	0	0	0	0	532,309	0	0	0	0	807,385
SHIP 15	214,594	0	19,463	0	0	0	387,587	0	6,387	0	0	628,031
Southeastern Alberta	364,221	36,867	38,759	0	29,302	0	861,223	35,900	0	0	39,788	1,406,060
St. Albert	235,750	0	190,782	0	0	0	629,485	0	0	0	3,398	1,059,415
Tri-Partite	571,887	30,700	657,039	0	0	5,297	2,371,765	0	0	0	91,068	3,727,756
Westview	268,386	62,303	316,771	0	0	0	541,346	53,817	0	0	58,081	1,300,704
Wood Buffalo	168,082	11,400	124,150	0	0	0	256,912	0	0	0	417,352	977,896
Total	**10,271,901**	**1,176,474**	**6,623,285**	**0**	**29,302**	**608,275**	**20,123,979**	**369,102**	**9,645**	**0**	**1,538,771**	**40,750,733**
% of total	25.2%	2.9%	16.3%	0.0%	0.1%	1.5%	49.4%	0.9%	0.02%	0.0%	3.8%	100.0%

Table 21 – Student Health Expenditures by Service Category 2010/2011

[1] "Other" services include psycho-educational assessments, key contact specialists, special projects and resource/clinical coordination.

APPENDIX F – List of Tables

Table	Topic	Page
1	Number of Service Categories provided by Student Health Partnerships 2010/2011 (n=17)	2
2	Number of Students Served in Each Service Category (Service Events)	4
3	Number of Service Events in Each Category and Percentage Change	5
4	Comparison of the Number of Service Events from 2009/2010 to 2010/2011	6
5a/b	Percentage of Students Who Completed Their Goals / Percentage of Students Who Benefited From Service Provider Recommendations	8
6a/b	Teacher Survey Results / Teacher Comments	9
7a/b	Parent Survey Result / Parent Comments	10
8a/b	Service Provider Survey Results / Service Provider Comments	11
9a/b	Partner Survey Results / Partner Comments	12
10	Total FTEs by Service Category	12
11	Total FTEs Planned and Filled	13
12	Total FTEs Planned and Number Filled for Each Service Category	15
13	Revenues 2010/2011	15
14	Expenditures 2010/2011	16
15	Expenditures by Service Category 2010/2011	22
16	Partnership Funding Allocations 2010/2011	23
17	Partnership Breakdown Number of Service Events by Service Category 2010/2011	24
18	Partnership Breakdown of Professional FTEs Planned and Actual 2010/2011	25
19	Partnership Breakdown of Para-Professional FTEs Planned and Actual 2010/2011	26
20	Partnership Breakdown of Revenues and Expenditures 2010/2011	27
21	Student Health Expenditures by Service Category 2010/2011	28
22	List of Tables	29

Table 22 – List of Tables